Quantum mutual information and quantumness vectors for multi-qubit systems

Sk Sazim[1,*] and Pankaj Agrawal[1,†]

[1]*Institute of Physics, Sainik School Post, Bhubaneswar-751005, Orissa, India.*

Characterization of the correlations of a multiparticle system remains an open problem. We generalize the notion of quantum discord, using multivariate mutual information, to characterize the quantum properties of a multiparticle system. This new measure, called dissension, is a set of numbers – quantumness vector. There are a number of different possible generalizations. We consider two of them. The Track-I generalization is discord type, while the Track-II generalization is based on all possible measurements. We give expressions for these generalizations for n-qubit systems, and explore some of their properties. We also consider a set of three-qubit and four-qubit states to illustrate the usefulness of the dissension vector.

arXiv:1607.05155v1 [quant-ph] 18 Jul 2016

* sk.sazimsq49@gmail.com
† agrawal@iopb.res.in

I. INTRODUCTION

In the quantum information science, one of the challenges is to understand the exact nature of correlations present in a multiparticle system. Because of its complex nature, we still have little success in this respect [1, 2]. Correlations, specially quantum correlations, have been very useful for a host of quantum information processing tasks, such as quantum computing [3–5], quantum cryptography [6], quantum metrology [7]. The quantum correlations also lie at the heart of quantum mysteries and account for many counter-intuitive features of the quantum world. Therefore, a understanding of the nature of quantum correlations is very important.

The correlations in a system can be of classical and/or quantum nature. Usually, it has been believed that quantum correlations are due to entanglement. A number of measures for this have also been proposed in the literature [2]. However, more recently, it has been suggested that the quantum correlations go beyond the simple idea of entanglement [1]. In particular, it has been argued that quantum discord [8, 9] quantifies all types of quantum correlations including entanglement. Discord is the difference between total correlations and classical correlations present in a state. In recent years, it has been one of the main topics of research [1, 10–15]. It has been shown that quantum discord also has operational significance [5, 16, 17]. A number of different measures of quantum correlations similar to quantum discord have been proposed in the literature. These are quantum deficit [18, 19], measurement induced disturbance [20], geometric discord [21], and many more.

It has recently been argued that the quantum discord, and similar information theoretic measures, actually not only quantifies entanglement, i.e., nonlocal quantumness but also local quantumness [22]. For example, it the presence of local quantumness, which leads to increase in discord by applying certain kinds of local noise [23]. It is still to be established that a state with zero entanglement and non-zero discord can act as a resource for a nonlocal task. In this sense, the phrase "quantum correlations beyond entanglement" may be a misnomer. However information theoretic measures like discord do seem to characterize quantum properties of a state beyond entanglement, in particular local quantumness. Such measures appear to characterize the quantum properties of a state more completely. Therefore, it will be useful to generalize the measures like quantum discord to multiparticle systems. There have been several attempts in this direction [1, 12, 15, 24]. We will use multivariate mutual information for our generalization.

One important point that we emphasize in this paper is the usefulness of a vector-like quantity to characterize and quantify the quantumness of a state. The correlations in mixed states of a system, or even pure states of a multiparticle system are multifaceted. They can not be characterized by just one number. We first illustrate it by considering two-qubit mixed states. We introduce a quantumness vector for characterizing these mixed states. This idea is then extended to multiparticle states. For generalization of quantum discord to n-qubit case, we use multivariate mutual information [15]. Classically this mutual information characterizes genuine multivariate correlations in n random variables. It is based on a Venn-diagram type approach. There exist many expressions for this n-variable mutual information, all of which are same classically but differ when conditional entropies are generalized to quantum level. For a multiparticle system, one can make measurement on one-particle, or on more than one-particle to probe the different aspects of the quantum correlations. This would lead to multiple quantities that can eventually characterize the correlations present in the system. Some such physical quantities, called "quantum dissension", were introduced in our previous work [15]. Here we extend the notion of dissension to two different tracks. In the first track we proceed in the usual way by which quantum discord was defined as difference of classical information from total amount of information present in the system. Then we extend the definition to multiparticle case. In the second approach we extend the notion of quantum correlation from the perspective of quantifying the maximum amount of correlation induced in the system as a result of measurement. All possible measurements are included. In each track, to characterize multiparticle correlations we will have $n-1$ quantities based on $(n-1)$ types of measurements we can have. For example, in the tripartite case, in each track we shall have two quantities that will characterize the correlations. Interestingly, these values can be negative because a measurement on a subsystem can enhance the correlations in the rest of the system. This approach emphasizes the fact that a single quantity alone is not sufficient to characterize the quantum properties of a state. This paves the way of defining quantum correlation as a vector quantity.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section II, we discuss classical mutual information and its extension to quantum regime. In Section III, we discuss correlations and quantumness. In Section IV, we extend the notion of discord along two different tracks and give expressions for dissension vectors for n-qubit case. In Section V, we analyze these measures with examples for two, three, and four-qubit cases. In Sections VI and VII, we address a few related issues. Finally we conclude in Section VIII.

II. MUTUAL INFORMATION AND ITS GENERALIZATION TO QUANTUM REGIME

Let us consider two random variables X and Y. The common information that they possess is characterized by mutual information

$$I(X:Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X,Y), \tag{1}$$

where $H(X)$ is Shannon entropy of X and $H(X,Y)$ is the joint entropy. There are many uses of mutual information. Our interest is in its ability to capture correlations between two probability distributions. Using chain rule, one can express mutual information also as,

$$\begin{aligned} I(X:Y) &= H(X) - H(X|Y), \\ &= H(Y) - H(Y|X), \\ &= H(X,Y) - (H(X|Y) + H(Y|X)), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $H(X|Y) = H(X,Y) - H(X)$ is the conditional entropy.

In quantum regime, mutual information is written in terms of Von Neumann entropy of density matrices. Intuitively this quantity solely should measure the correlations between two subsystems of a bipartite density matrix. But in reality it does not. It is sometimes suggested that the mutual information quantifies the total correlations of a bipartite system [25]. However, in general what it characterizes about the state is somewhat elusive [26, 27]. Also the generalization of this quantity to quantum regime leads to many new features and complexities. One way of generalization is that of replacing the probability distributions with density matrices and another is using relative entropy, i.e., for a bipartite state ρ_{xy},

$$\begin{aligned} I^q(X:Y) &= S(X) + S(Y) - S(X,Y), \\ &= S(\rho_{XY} \parallel \rho_X \otimes \rho_Y), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $S(X) = -\operatorname{Tr}(\rho_X \log_2 \rho_X)$ represents Von Neumann entropy and $S(\rho \parallel \sigma) = \operatorname{Tr} \rho(\log_2 \rho - \log_2 \sigma)$ is relative entropy.

A. Quantum conditional entropy and mutual information

The generalization of Eq. (2) for the bipartite quantum state ρ_{XY} are,

$$\begin{aligned} I^q_Y(X:Y) &= S(X) - S(X|Y), \\ I^q_X(X:Y) &= S(Y) - S(Y|X), \\ I^q_a(X:Y) &= S(X,Y) - (S(X|Y) + S(Y|X)), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $S(X|Y)$ is the quantum conditional entropy. If we directly extend the classical conditional entropy expression to quantum domain, then $S(X|Y) = S(X,Y) - S(Y)$, which is negative for pure entangled state. This negativity of conditional entropy was explained in the references [28–32]. However, there is an alternate view which says that to know a state we have to make a measurement [9]. This is then the meaning of "conditional". So, conditional entropy can also be expressed as,

$$S(X|Y) = \sum_i p_i S(\rho_{X|\pi_i^Y}), \tag{5}$$

where $\rho_{X|\pi_i^Y} = \frac{1}{p_i} \operatorname{Tr}_Y(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \pi_i^Y)\rho_{XY}(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \pi_i^Y)$ with $p_i = \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \pi_i^Y)\rho_{XY}(\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \pi_i^Y)$. $\mathbb{I}_p$ is the identity matrix of order p and $\{\pi_i^Y;\ i = 1, 2\}$ are, in general, the rank one positive operator valued measure (POVM) on part Y.

B. Multiparticle mutual information

Our goal in this paper is to examine multiparticle systems. So we need a generalization of the bipartite mutual information to a multiparticle situation. We will use the usual generalization based on Venn diagram approach. In this approach, three variable mutual information for three variables X, Y and Z is defined as

$$I_0(X:Y:Z) = I(X:Y) - I(X:Y|Z), \tag{6}$$

where $I(X:Y|Z) = H(X|Z) + H(Y|Z) - H(X,Y|Z)$ is conditional mutual information [33]. This can be immediately generalized to n-variate mutual information. Using chain rules, this generalization will lead to the multivariate mutual information as,

$$I_0(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) = \sum_{p=1}^{n} (-1)^{p-1} \sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} H(x_{l_1}, x_{l_2}, ..., x_{l_p}). \tag{7}$$

In literature, this quantity is also known as the 'interaction information. By analogy, one can write the multiparticle mutual information of the state $\rho_{x_1 x_2 .. x_n}$ as,

$$I^q_0(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) = \sum_{p=1}^{n} (-1)^{p-1} \sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} S(x_{l_1}, x_{l_2}, .., x_{l_p}), \tag{8}$$

where $\{l_p\}$ in the sum denotes $l_1 < l_2 < l_3 ... < l_p$ and l_i varies from 1 to n. This generalization has not been explored much. In this paper, we will use this generalization and define a vector type correlation measure to characterize and quantify multiparticle correlations.

However, there exist at least two more mutual information like quantities in literature. First one is known as 'total correlation'. The total correlation for three variables is

$$I(X:Y:Z) = I(X:Y) + I(XY:Z), \tag{9}$$

where $I(XY:Z) = I(X:Z) + I(Y:Z|X)$. This quantity can be generalized for multi-variables i.e.,

$$I(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} H(x_i) - H(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n). \tag{10}$$

This can easily be generalized to quantum regime for the state $\rho_{x_1 x_2 ... x_n}$

$$\begin{aligned} I^q(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) &= \sum_{p=1}^{n} S(x_i) - S(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \\ &= S(\rho_{x_1,x_2,...,x_n} \parallel \otimes_{i=1}^{n} \rho_{x_i}). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The second line of the Eq.(11) shows that it is a distance between the state and tensor products of its marginals. This generalization has been used in literature [25] to capture total correlations in a multiparticle quantum state. Note that the above generalization is always positive.

Another possible quantity is the 'dual total correlation', or 'binding information' or, sometime known as 'secrecy monotone' [34]. For three random variables it is expressed as

$$I_s(X:Y:Z) = I(X:YZ) + I(Y:Z|X), \tag{12}$$

where $I(X:YZ) = I(X:Y) + I(X:Z|Y)$. The above quantity can be generalized for multi-variables i.e.,

$$I_s(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} H(x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, ..., x_n) - (n-1)H(x_1, ..., x_n). \tag{13}$$

This quantity can easily be extended to the quantum state, $\rho_{x_1 x_2 ... x_n}$

$$I_s^q(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} S(x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, ..., x_n) - (n-1)S(x_1, ..., x_n). \tag{14}$$

Note that the above quantity is also always positive [35] and for pure states $I^q(x_1:x_2:...:x_n) = I_s^q(x_1:x_2:...:x_n)$. This quantity has been used in literature for capturing correlations in a quantum state [35] and to detect the shared secret correlations between the parties [34]. The total correlation, $I^q(x_1:x_2:...:x_n)$ and the binding information, $I_s^q(x_1:x_2:...:x_n)$ are monotones under LOCC (local operation and classical communication) [34]. Moreover, the Eqs.(8, 11 and 14) reduce to $I^q(x_1:x_2)$. The Fig.(1) depicts the relations between the possible generalizations of multivariate mutual information. These relations may not hold for quantum case. From the diagram, it is clear that only I_0 characterizes genuine multipartite correlations. Other two generalizations, I and I_s also contain bipartite correlations. We are using generalization of I_0 to quantum domain.

C. Can Mutual Information be negative?

One feature of the multivariate mutual information, as given by Venn diagram approach, is that it can be negative. Sometimes, it is considered a negative aspect of this approach. However, as we will see, the negative value characterizes a very special type of correlations. For this we consider mutual information [33] of three variables X, Y and Z, as given in Eq.(6). In this definition, both $I(X:Y)$ and $I(X:Y|Z)$ are non-negative, but $I(X:Y:Z)$ can be negative, when $I(X:Y) < I(X:Y|Z)$. This situation will occur when knowing Z enhances the correlation between X and Y. Let us take a well known example of 'modulo 2 addition ($\oplus$) of two binary random variables (XOR-gate)'. Suppose, $X \oplus Y = Z$. If X and Y are independent then $I(X:Y) = 0$. However, once we know the value of Z, knowing the value of X uniquely determines the value of Y. Hence the knowledge of Z enhances the correlation between X and Y, i.e., $I(X:Y|Z)$ is non-zero. This implies when $I(X:Y:Z)$ is negative, it captures certain aspect of the correlations among the variables X, Y and Z.



FIG. 1: Venn diagram: The information theoretic quantities for three random variables, X, Y, and Z. The total correlation, $I(X:Y:Z) = I_s(X:Y:Z) + I_0(X:Y:Z)$, and the binding information, $I_s(X:Y:Z) = I(X:Y|Z) + I(X:Z|Y) + I(Y:Z|X) + I_0(X:Y:Z)$, where $I_0(X:Y:Z)$ is the interaction information.

The generalization of Eq. (6) in the quantum regime, for the state ρ_{XYZ} is

$$I_0^q(X:Y:Z) = I^q(X:Y) - I^q(X:Y|Z), \tag{15}$$

where $I^q(X:Y|Z) = S(X|Z) + S(Y|Z) - S(XY|Z)$ is conditional mutual information. Let us consider the case of a three-qubit GHZ state $|g_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)$. If we trace out any one qubit from the state then the reduced density matrix is a mixture of product states, i.e., $\rho_r = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|)$. For this state, the mutual information is $I^q(X:Y) = 1$. Next, we have to compute $I^q(X:Y|Z)$ for $\rho_{g_3} = |g_3\rangle\langle g_3|$. Its value will depend on the measurement basis. We know $S(XY|Z) = 0$ in any measurement basis but other two terms $S(X|Z)$ and $S(Y|Z)$ depend on the measurement basis. If we do measurement in computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ on qubit Z, the conditional mutual information $I^q(X:Y|Z) = 0$ because both $S(X|Z)$ and $S(Y|Z)$ are zero. So the total mutual information is $I_0^q(X:Y:Z) = 1$, i.e., positive. It is not surprising because the state of remaining two qubits, after measurement on one qubit, does not have enhanced entanglement. But if we do measurement on one qubit, say Z, in Hadamard basis $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$, the mutual information, $I^q(X:Y|Z) = 2$, which means, total mutual information is $I_0^q(X:Y:Z) = -1$, i.e., negative. This is expected, since now the state of two qubits XY is a Bell state; so measurement on Z qubit has enhanced the entanglement in XY subsystem. The essence of this discussion is that in both classical and quantum regime multivariate mutual information can be negative, characterizing a special type of correlations.

III. CORRELATIONS AND QUANTUMNESS

Whether a quantum state (of more than one particle) has correlations or not, is often far from obvious. This is because the meaning of the word 'correlation', as often used in literature, is quite fluid. We know the meaning of correlation in classical world but in the case of a quantum state there are classicality and quantumness. This makes the nature of correlations very complex. If we take the intuitive meaning of correlations [2], then quantum correlations are nonlocal in nature, and can be taken as due to entanglement of the state only. They exist due to the nonlocal quantumness of a state. A state can also have classical correlations [9] and local quantumness [15]. When we speak of quantumness of a state, it can be local or nonlocal in character. Information theoretic measures like quantum discord, and its generalization like dissension, characterize and quantify both types of quantumness. Next we emphasize the need of a vector measure to characterize the quantumness of a state. We then expand on local and nonlocal quantumness.

A. Quantum Discord: Is one number sufficient?

In the reference [8, 9], authors have given a way of quantifying quantum correlations present in bipartite two-qubit states through quantum discord. To do so they used different generalizations of the mutual information to quantum regime. Let us consider the bipartite state ρ_{xy}. Then using Eqs. (3 and 4), the discord is defined in the following way,

$$\delta_j(\rho_{xy}) = \inf_{\pi^j}\{I_0^q(x:y) - I_j(i:j)\}, \tag{16}$$

where $I_j(i:j) = S(i) - S(i|j)$ with $\{i, j;\ i \neq j\} = x, y$. Obviously the above definition is not symmetric in the parties. When $j = y$, it is usual discord and for $j = x$ it is $\delta_x(\rho_{xy})$. Sometimes one of the discords is zero even when other is nonzero. If we take that the quantum discord captures 'quantumness' present in a state, it is quite clear that we need both the discords to know the exact quantumness of the state.

One can define 'another discord' as,

$$\delta_a(\rho_{xy}) = \inf_{\{\pi^x, \pi^y\}} \{I_0^q(x:y) - I_a(x:y)\}. \tag{17}$$

This definition is symmetric in the parties. This quantity is nothing but the sum of the two discords $\delta_x(\rho_{xy})$ and $\delta_y(\rho_{xy})$.

Let us compute the above quantities in the following examples. For this purpose we introduce a vector-type quantity $\{\delta_x, \delta_y\}$ instead of using δ_x and δ_y separately. It is a quantumness vector – discord vector.

(E1) *Product and classical states:* Consider two-qubit states

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_p &= |++\rangle\langle++|, \\ \rho_c &= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Here, $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$. These states are purely classical and the values are $\{\delta_x, \delta_y\} = \{0, 0\}$, $\delta_a = 0$.

(E2) *Classical-quantum (CQ)/quantum-classical (QC) states:* We now consider two types of states, one classical-quantum state and other quantum-classical state

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{cq} &= \frac{1}{2}(|++\rangle\langle++| + |-0\rangle\langle -0|), \\ \rho_{qc} &= \frac{1}{2}(|++\rangle\langle++| + |0-\rangle\langle 0-|). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The values are $\{\delta_x(\rho_{cq}), \delta_y(\rho_{cq})\} = \{0, 0.2\}$, $\delta_a(\rho_{cq}) = 0.2$ and $\{\delta_x(\rho_{qc}), \delta_y(\rho_{qc})\} = \{0.2, 0.0\}$, $\delta_a(\rho_{qc}) = 0.2$. We clearly see, that to characterize ρ_{cq} and ρ_{qc} completely, we need discord vector. δ_a is same for both the states.

(E3) *Separable quantum-quantum (QQ) states:* A QQ-state is

$$\rho_{qq} = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |++\rangle\langle++|). \tag{20}$$

For this state, $\{\delta_x(\rho_{qq}), \delta_x(\rho_{qq})\} = \{0.15, 0.15\}$, $\delta_a(\rho_{qq}) = 0.3$.

(E4) *Pure entangle states:* A pure entangle state is

$$|g_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle). \tag{21}$$

For this state, $\{\delta_x(\rho_{g_2}), \delta_x(\rho_{g_2})\} = \{0.15, 0.15\}$, $\delta_a(\rho_{g_2}) = 0.3$, where $\rho_{g_2} = |g_2\rangle\langle g_2|$.

The above vector type quantification of correlation reveals more information about the correlation of a state than δ_x or δ_y alone.

B. Local and nonlocal quantumness

As has been argued in [22], the quantities like quantum discord not only characterize nonlocal quantumness (i.e., entanglement), but also local quantumness. Same will continue to hold for the generalizations of the discord that we will discuss. Let us recall these aspects of quantumness.

Let us consider the example states of the previous subsection. We found that the both X-discord and Y-discord are zero for ρ_p and ρ_c. But X-discord is zero and Y-discord is non-zero for ρ_{cq} and both discords are non-zero for ρ_{qq}. Now consider the state, ρ_p. In Hadamard basis, there is no superposition in it but in computational basis there is. So one can mask the local superposition of the state ρ_p and hence discord is zero. State ρ_c is the mixture of orthogonal states and there is no local quantumness in it. But the states ρ_{cq} and ρ_{qq} are the mixture of non-orthogonal states. State ρ_{cq} has local superposition in one part and that's why one of the discords is non-zero for this case but for ρ_{qq} both parts have local superposition.

One might say that a mixture of non-orthogonal separable states has local quantumness, i.e., local superposition, which cannot be hidden by writing down another decomposition of the density matrix. To illustrate the various feature of a state, let us consider the generalized Werner state [22],

$$\rho_{wg} = \frac{(1-p)}{4}\mathbb{I}_4 + p\rho_{lk}, \tag{22}$$

where $\rho_{lk} = |\psi\rangle_{lk}\langle\psi|$ with $|\psi\rangle_{lk} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+k^2}}(|\phi(l)\phi(l)\rangle + k|\phi(l)^{\perp}\phi(l)^{\perp}\rangle)$ and $|\phi(l)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|l|^2}}(|0\rangle + l|1\rangle)$, $|\phi(l)\rangle^{\perp} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|l|^2}}(-l^*|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$. Here p is classical mixing parameter, whereas l and k are the local and nonlocal parameters due to their role in local and nonlocal superposition respectively. The state (see Eq.(22)) is separable if $p \leq \frac{1+k^2}{1+4k+k^2}$ but discord is non-zero and it depends on l. For $p > \frac{1+k^2}{1+4k+k^2}$ the discord is non-zero and dependence on l is decreasing. The detailed discussion can be found in [22]. Hence, the above state (see Eq.(22)) has both local and nonlocal quantumness.

IV. DISSENSION VECTORS

From the discussion of the last section, it is clear that a vector-type correlation measure is better in describing the quantum properties of a state. Using multivariate mutual information, we will now generalize the quantum discord to n-qubit system, calling it dissension. We will introduce two types of quantumness vectors – called dissension vectors.

Let us consider a state $\rho_{x_1x_2...x_n}$ in Hilbert space $H_2 \otimes H_2 \otimes ... \otimes H_2$ where x_i qubit is with i^{th} party. The mutual information for this state is

$$I_0^q(x_1 : x_2 : ... : x_n) = \sum_{p=1}^{n}(-1)^{p-1}\sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} S(x_{l_1}, x_{l_2}, .., x_{l_p}), \tag{23}$$

where $\{l_p\}$ in the sum denotes $l_1 < l_2 < l_3... < l_p$. Using chain rule, we can now introduce conditional entropies. These conditional entropies are to be understood in terms of measurements. In this way, one can introduce one party, two party, ..., $(n-1)$-party measurements in the above expression of mutual information (see Eq.(23)) and each leads one to a expression for new mutual information. When more than one party is involved, joint measurement is to be implemented. Following reference [15], one can have mutual information with all possible conditionals which we called Track-II type definition, but following [8, 9] one can have mutual information with smaller number of conditionals which we call Track-I (or discord track) definition of mutual information.

A. Track-I

Let us consider the most general situation where we have state $\rho_{x_1x_2...x_n}$ with n number of qubits. On the basis of m-party joint measurement (One can employ local measurements simultaneously.), we will have $(n-1)$ expressions for mutual information $\{I_m^1(x_1 : x_2 : ... : x_n); m = 1, 2, ..., (n-1)\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_m^1(x_1 : x_2 : ... : x_n) = &\sum_{k=1}^{m-1}(-1)^{k-1}\sum_{\{l_k\}}^{n} S(x_{l_1}, x_{l_2}, .., x_{l_k}) \\ &+ (-1)^{m-1}\sum_{\{k_{m-1}\};k_1=2} S(x_1, x_{k_1}, ..., x_{k_{m-1}}) \\ &+ \sum_{p=m+1}^{n}(-1)^{p-1}\sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} S(x_{l_1}, .., x_{l_{p-m}}|x_{l_{p-m+1}}, .., x_{l_p}) \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where, $S(x_{l_1}, .., x_{l_{p-m}}|x_{l_{p-m+1}}, .., x_{l_p})$ denotes conditional entropy where joint measurement are to be done on parties $x_{l_{p-m+1}}, .., x_{l_p}$. We can define dissension function, $D_m^1(\rho_{x_1x_2...x_n}) = (-1)^n(I_0^q - I_m^1)$, and then the dissension,

$$\delta_m^1 = \inf_{\pi_m}[(-1)^n(I_0^q - I_m^1)], \tag{25}$$

where minimization is done over m-party measurement. The expressions of mutual information in Eq.(24) are not symmetric under interchange of parties. For example, if we take $m = 1$, I_1^1 can have n number of different expressions which are very different from one another. In Eq. (24), if we put $m = 1$, we can have one type of I_1^1; let us name it $I_{x_n}^1$. Now exchanging x_n with $x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n-1}$ respectively one can have others. So we have n number of δ_1^1. We label them as $\delta_{x_p}^1 = (-1)^n(I_0^q - I_{x_p}); p = 1, 2, ..., n$. This leads us to define dissension vector

$$\vec{\delta_1^1} = \{\delta_{x_p}^1; p = 1, 2, ..., n\}. \tag{26}$$

In this way with some particular choice of entries one can have $n-1$ vectors i.e., $\vec{\delta_i^1}; i = 1, 2, ..., (n-1)$.

B. Track II

Next we extend the definitions of mutual information in this track for all possible m party conditionals and we have the expression for mutual information i.e., $I^2_m; m = 1, 2, ..., (n-1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} I^2_m = \sum_{k=1}^{m-1}(-1)^{k-1}\sum_{\{l_k\}}^{n} S(x_{l_1}, x_{l_2}, .., x_{l_k}) + (-1)^{m-1}\Bigg[\sum_{\{k_{m-1}\};k_1=2}^{n-1}\{S(x_1, x_{k_1}, ..., x_{k_{m-1}}, x_{k_{m-1}+1}) \\ - \ S(x_{k_{m-1}+1}|x_1, x_{k_1}, ..., x_{k_{m-1}})\} + \cdots\cdots\cdots + S(x_1, x_2, x_{k_{n-m+2}}, x_{k_{n-m+3}}, ..., x_{n-1}, x_n) \\ - \ S(x_2|x_1, x_{k_{n-m+2}}, ..., x_{n-1}, x_n)\Big] + \sum_{p=m+1}^{n}(-1)^{p-1}\sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} S(x_{l_1}, .., x_{l_{p-m}}|x_{l_{p-m+1}}, .., x_{l_p}). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

The dissension function in this track is defined as $D^2_m = (-1)^n(I^q_0 - I^2_m)$. Therefore, the dissensions are

$$\delta^2_m = \inf_{\pi_m}[(-1)^n(I^q_0 - I^2_m)]. \tag{28}$$

If we interchange parties, the mutual information in the Eq. (27) will not remain same except for $m = (n-1)$. For example if we consider $m = 1$ in the Eq. (27, we will get one I^2_1; let us call it as $I^2_{x_n}$. Now interchanging x_n with $x_1, x_2, ..., x_{n-1}$ respectively we will get others. In this way, we will have n numbers of δ^2_1. If we label them as $\delta^2_{x_p} = (-1)^n(I^q_0 - I^2_{x_p}); p = 1, 2, ..., n$, we have dissension vector

$$\vec{\delta^2_1} = \{\delta^2_{x_p}; p = 1, 2, ..., n\}. \tag{29}$$

With some particular choice of entries one can have $n-2$ vectors i.e., $\vec{\delta^2_i}; i = 1, 2, ..., (n-2)$ and one symmetric quantity δ^2_{n-1} which we call dissension vectors in Track-II.

Now, we have defined the "dissension function" D^t_m, where m is for 'on how many qubit measurements are done' and t is for the 'track you are taking'. All the dissension functions can be expressed in terms of 'usual discord' as,

$$\begin{aligned} D^1_m &= \sum_{p=m+1}^{n}(-1)^{n+p}\sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} D(x_{l_1}, ..., x_{l_{p-m}} : x_{l_{p-m+1}}...x_{l_p}), \\ D^2_m &= \sum_{p=m+1}^{n}(-1)^{n+p}\sum_{\{l_p\}}^{n} D(x_{l_1}, ..., x_{l_{p-m}} : x_{l_{p-m+1}}...x_{l_p}) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{2n+1}\Bigg[\sum_{(l_n)}^{n} D(x_{l_1}, ..., x_{l_{n-m}} : x_{l_{n-m+1}}...x_{l_n}) \\ &\quad - \ D(x_1, ..., x_{n-m} : x_{n-m+1}...x_n)\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where (l_n) is abbreviation of $l_1, l_2, ..., l_n$ with each term taking any values from 1 to n. Note that the quantity, $D(X : Y) = I^q(X : Y) - I_Y(X : Y)$ is the bipartite discord function. Hence, one may get different dissensions just by computing the bipartite discords.

V. SIMPLE ILLUSTRATIONS

In this section, we will present our numerical results for a set of two-qubit, three-qubit, and four-qubit states. It will illustrate the usefulness of the discord and dissension vectors. We will consider track-I and track-II dissension vectors, as defined in the last section. We will see that both tracks are most of the time useful.

A. Two-qubit states

Correlation (or, quantumness) present in a bipartite two-qubit system have been explored extensively in literature. Discord was one of them, Our modified vectorial approach will capture the complete quantumness of the states. We have already discussed the quantumness properties by finding the discord vectors for several states in subsection III-A. Here, we consider the Werner state,

$$\rho_{wer} = \frac{(1-p)}{4}\mathbb{I}_4 + p\rho_{g_2}. \tag{31}$$

The Fig.(2) depicts the behaviour of the dissension vectors of the states in Eq. (31). The plot of dissension vectors, δ_x^1 and δ_y^1 shows that it contains both local and nonlocal quantumness because for $p \leq \frac{1}{3}$, the Werner state is separable.



FIG. 2: The figure shows how the $\vec{\delta_1^1}$ (For Werner state, $\delta_x^1 = \delta_y^1$.) behaves as a function of mixing parameter p for the Werner state, ρ_{wer}.

B. Three-qubit states

The dissension vectors for three-qubit states in track-I are,

$$\vec{\delta_1^1} = \{\delta_{1k}^1;\ k = x, y, z\} \text{ and } \vec{\delta_2^1} = \{\delta_{2k}^1;\ k = x, y, z\},$$

where $\delta_{1k}^1 = I_{1k}^1 - I_0^q$ and $\delta_{2k}^1 = I_{2k}^1 - I_0^q$ with $I_{1k}^1 = S(i) - (S(i|j) + S(i|k) + S(j|k)) + S(ij|k)$ and $I_{2k}^1 = S(i) + S(j) + S(k) - (S(ik) + S(jk)) + S(k|ij)$. And $I_0^q = S(x) + S(y) + S(z) - (S(x, y) + S(x, z) + S(y, z)) + S(x, y, z)$. The mutual information I_{1k}^1 is not symmetric in $\{i, j, k;\ (i \neq j \neq k)\}$ i.e., interchanging i, j, or k one can get many expressions but all will give the same value after the maximization over measurement. So there will be three inequivalent expression for I_{1k}^1. And similarly for I_{2k}^1.

In track-II, the dissension vectors are,

$$\vec{\delta_1^2} = \{\delta_{1k}^2;\ k = x, y, z\},\ \text{and } \delta_2^2,$$

where $\delta_{1k}^2 = I_{1k}^2 - I_0^q$ and $\delta_2^2 = I_2 - I_0^q$ with $I_{1k}^2 = S(ij) - (S(i|j) + S(j|i) + S(i|k) + S(j|k)) + S(ij|k)$ and $I_2 = S(x) + S(y) + S(z) + (S(x|yz) + S(y|xz) + S(z|xy)) - 2S(x, y, z)$. The mutual information I_{1k} can have many forms for a fixed k but after maximization on measurement those expression give same result. The quantity, δ_2^2 is the equal to $\sum_k \delta_{2k}^1$ i.e., symmetric discord.

To see the usefulness of these vectors, let us consider the following three-qubit states. For convenience we will divide the states in following categories:

I) **Product states**: We consider here a simple product state i.e.,

$$\rho_{pro} = |000\rangle\langle 000|. \tag{32}$$

This state has no quantum and classical correlations (see the tables I and II). All dissension vectors are zero for this state.

II) **Classical states**: A generic example of classical state in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis is

$$\rho_{ccc} = \frac{1}{2}(|000\rangle\langle 000| + |111\rangle\langle 111|). \tag{33}$$

The non-zero dissension vectors for this state are $\vec{\delta_1^1}$ in track-I and $\vec{\delta_1^2}$ in track-II. These are given in the tables I and II. We see that dissension vectors here are different from that of the product state. This state has only classical correlations. For each track

there is only one nonzero dissension vector with integer entries.

III) **Separable states**: We have picked up some important separable states for illustration. These three different states represent three different structures. The states are

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{ccq} &= \frac{1}{2}(|00+\rangle\langle 00+|+|110\rangle\langle 110|),\\ \rho_{qqc} &= \frac{1}{2}(|++0\rangle\langle ++0|+|001\rangle\langle 001|),\\ \rho_{qqq} &= \frac{1}{2}(|+++\rangle\langle +++|+|000\rangle\langle 000|),\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$. These separable states have one or more parts as *quantum*. We can also write down states ρ_{qcc}, ρ_{cqc} with structure similar to the first state of (see, Eq.(34)). Also, the states ρ_{cqq}, ρ_{qcq} have structure similar to that of ρ_{qqc}. The 'quantumness' in these states is 'local quantumness'. The non-zero dissension vectors (see the tables I and II) of these states are $\vec{\delta}_1^1$ in track-I and $\vec{\delta}_1^2$ in track-II, but have different values than that of classical states. Here values are non-integer.

IV) **Pure entangled states**: Here, we take two examples of pure entangled states and one pure biseparable one. The states are

$$\begin{aligned}|g_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle),\\ |\psi\rangle_{i|jk} &= |0\rangle_i|g_2\rangle_{jk}, \quad \text{where } i \neq j \neq k \in (x,y,z)\\ |w\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|100\rangle + |010\rangle + |001\rangle).\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Out of these states $|\psi\rangle_{i|jk}$ are biseparable states of the structure $1|23$, $2|13$ and $3|12$. For a specific bipartition, these states are product states, but if three parties share the state then two parties will be entangled with each other while the third one will be completely separable with the rest. The GHZ state $|g_3\rangle$ is a maximally entangled state. The W-state, $|w\rangle$, belongs to a different class. The dissension vectors for these states are given in the tables I and II, which characterize the state very well.

V) **Mixed entangled states**: In this category, we consider two types of states, one biseparable and other mixed entangled. The biseparable states are

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^c_{x|yz} &= \frac{1}{2}(|0\psi^+\rangle\langle 0\psi^+|+|1\phi^+\rangle\langle 1\phi^+|),\\ \rho^q_{x|yz} &= \frac{1}{2}(|+\psi^+\rangle\langle +\psi^+|+|0\phi^+\rangle\langle 0\phi^+|),\\ \rho_m &= \frac{1}{2}(|+\psi^+\rangle\langle +\psi^+|+|\phi^+0\rangle\langle \phi^+0|),\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where $|\psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ and $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$.

For these states, the dissension vectors are listed in the tables I and II. the dissension vectors one can clearly characterize the states. The mixed entangled states that we consider are

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{wg} &= (1-p)\rho_w + p\rho_{g_3},\\ \rho_{wwc} &= (1-p)\rho_{wc} + p\rho_w,\\ \rho_{wer} &= \frac{(1-p)}{8}I + p\rho_{g_3},\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $|wc\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|011\rangle + |101\rangle + |110\rangle)$. Out of these states, ρ_{wer} is the Werner state in three qubit scenario. In Fig.(3) we have plotted the behaviour of the dissension vectors as a function of mixing parameter p. Different vectors have different behaviour.

C. Four-qubit states

In case of four-qubit system, there are three dissension vectors, in track-I and two vectors and one symmetric discord in track-II. The exact form of these vectors in track-I are,

$$\vec{\delta}_1^1 = \{\delta_{1l}^1;\ l = x,y,z,w\},\ \vec{\delta}_2^1 = \{\delta_{2l}^1;\ l = x,y,z,w\} \text{ and } \vec{\delta}_3^1 = \{\delta_{3l}^1;\ l = x,y,z,w\},$$

State	$\vec{\delta}_1^1$	$\vec{\delta}_2^1$
ρ_{pro}	$\{0, 0, 0\}$	$\{0, 0, 0\}$
ρ_{ccc}	$\{-2, -2, -2\}$	$\{0, 0, 0\}$
ρ_{ccq}	$\{-1.2, -1.2, -1.6\}$	$\{0, 0, 0\}$
ρ_{cqc}	$\{-1.2, -1.6, -1.2\}$	$\{0, 0, 0\}$
ρ_{qcc}	$\{-1.6, -1.2, -1.2\}$	$\{0, 0, 0\}$
ρ_{qqc}	$\{-0.99, -0.99, -0.78\}$	$\{0, 0, 0.22\}$
ρ_{qcq}	$\{-0.99, -0.78, -0.99\}$	$\{0, 0.22, 0\}$
ρ_{cqq}	$\{-0.78, -0.99, -0.99\}$	$\{0.22, 0, 0\}$
ρ_{qqq}	$\{-0.67, -0.67, -0.67\}$	$\{0.15, 0.15, 0.15\}$
ρ_{g_3}	$\{-2, -2, -2\}$	$\{1, 1, 1\}$
$\rho_{x\shortmid yz}$	$\{-1, 0, 0\}$	$\{0, 1, 1\}$
$\rho_{y\shortmid xz}$	$\{0, -1, 0\}$	$\{1, 0, 1\}$
$\rho_{z\shortmid xy}$	$\{0, 0, -1\}$	$\{1, 1, 0\}$
$\rho^c_{x\shortmid yz}$	$\{-1, 0, 0\}$	$\{0, 1, 1\}$
$\rho^q_{x\shortmid yz}$	$\{-0.71, 0, 0\}$	$\{0, 0.6, 0.6\}$
ρ_m	$\{-0.26, -0.03, -0.26\}$	$\{0.52, 0.8, 0.52\}$
ρ_w	$\{-1.08, -1.08, -1.08\}$	$\{0.92, 0.92, 0.92\}$

TABLE I: Track-I dissension vectors for a few three-qubit states. Here, $\rho_{g_3} = |g_3\rangle\langle g_3|$, $\rho_w = |w\rangle\langle w|$, $\rho_{wc} = |wc\rangle\langle wc|$, and $\rho_{i\shortmid jk} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{i\shortmid jk}$ (see Eq.(35)).

State	$\vec{\delta}_1^2$	$\vec{\delta}_2^2$
ρ_{pro}	$\{0, 0, 0\}$	0
ρ_{ccc}	$\{-3, -3, -3\}$	0
ρ_{ccq}	$\{-1.8, -1.8, -2.6\}$	0
ρ_{cqc}	$\{-1.8, -2.6, -1.8\}$	0
ρ_{qcc}	$\{-2.6, -1.8, -1.8\}$	0
ρ_{qqc}	$\{-1.6, -1.6, -1.17\}$	0.22
ρ_{qcq}	$\{-1.6, -1.17, -1.6\}$	0.22
ρ_{cqq}	$\{-1.17, -1.6, -1.6\}$	0.22
ρ_{qqq}	$\{-1.06, -1.06, -1.06\}$	0.45
ρ_{g_3}	$\{-3, -3, -3\}$	3
$\rho_{x\shortmid yz}$	$\{-2, 0, 0\}$	2
$\rho_{y\shortmid xz}$	$\{0, -2, 0\}$	2
$\rho_{z\shortmid xy}$	$\{0, 0, -2\}$	2
$\rho^c_{x\shortmid yz}$	$\{-2, 0, 0\}$	2
$\rho^q_{x\shortmid yz}$	$\{-1.8, 0, 0\}$	1.2
ρ_m	$\{-0.66, -0.15, -0.66\}$	1.84
ρ_w	$\{-1.75, -1.75, -1.75\}$	2.76

TABLE II: Track-II dissension vectors for a few three-qubit states.



FIG. 3: The figure shows how the dissension vectors behave as a function of mixing parameter p for the three qubit mixed states ρ_{gw}, ρ_{wwc} and ρ_{wer}. The subfigures $[(i)-(iii)]$ depict the behaviour of the dissensions for the state ρ_{gw}, $[(iv)-(vi)]$ for ρ_{wwc} and $[(vii)-(ix)]$ for ρ_{wer} where subfigures (i), (iv) and (vii) depict $\vec{\delta}_1^1$; (ii), (v) and (vii) depict $\vec{\delta}_2^1$ and (iii), (vi) and (ix) depict $\vec{\delta}_1^2$. (Note that we have plotted one of the elements from each dissension vectors. This is because within a vector each elements are same as the states are symmetric.)

where $\delta_{1l}^1 = I_0^q - I_{1l}^1$, $\delta_{2l}^1 = I_0^q - I_{2l}^1$ and $\delta_{3l}^1 = I_0^q - I_{3l}^1$ with I_{1l}^1, I_{2l}^1 and I_{3l}^1 are conditional mutual informations with conditionals on one qubit, two qubits and three qubits respectively and I_0^q is mutual information of a four-qubit states without conditional. Now consider I_{1l}^1, for fixed l, we have three different qubits (i, j, k). Permuting them one can have many inequivalent expressions but on maximization over measurement they will give same value. Same goes for I_{2l}^1 and I_{3l}^1.

In track-II the dissension vectors are,

$$\vec{\delta}_1^2 = \{\delta_{1l}^2;\ k = x, y, z, w\},\ \vec{\delta}_2^2 = \{\delta_{2l}^2;\ l = x, y, z, w\} \text{ and } \delta_3^2,$$

where $\delta_{1l}^2 = I_0^q - I_{1l}^2$, $\delta_{2l}^2 = I_0^q - I_{2l}^2$ and $\delta_{3l}^2 = I_0^q - I_{3l}^2$ with I_{1l}^2, I_{2l}^2 and I_{3l}^2 are conditional mutual informations with conditionals (all possible) on one qubit, two qubits and three qubits respectively and I_0^q is mutual information of a four-qubit states without conditional. Now consider I_{1l}^2, for fixed l, we have three different qubits (i, j, k). Permuting them on can have many inequivalent expressions but on maximization over measurement they will give same value. Same goes for I_{2l}^2. And δ_{3l}^2 is symmetric discord i.e., $\sum_l \delta_{2l}^1$.

With the above dissension vectors, we will quantify the quantumness present in certain classes of states. We consider the following categories:

I) **Product states**: A multiqubit state is said to be a product state if it can be expressed in the form $\rho = \otimes_i^n \rho_i$, where ρ_i are single qubit pure states. For our convenience we are taking $\rho_{pro} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{pro}$, where $|\psi\rangle_{pro} = |0000\rangle$ as a prototype product state. From the tables (III and IV), we can see that the dissension vectors for the state is a null vector i.e., $\vec{0}$. This is just like three-qubit case. It will continue to be so, as we will go to higher qubit states.

II) **Classical states**: A multiqubit classical state can be expressed as $\rho = \sum_{j=1}^2 p_j \otimes_i^n \rho_i^j$, where ρ_i^j are single qubit pure states and ρ_i^k is orthogonal to ρ_i^ℓ. Note, it is not necessary that all the component qubits should be same, it can be different as long as they constitute orthogonal sets. A simple example of this type of state is $\rho_{cl} = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle\langle 0000| + |1111\rangle\langle 1111|)$. From

the tables III and IV, we notice that only non-zero dissension vectors are $\vec{\delta}_2^1$ (track-I) and $\vec{\delta}_2^2$ (track-II). Situation here is similar to that of three-qubit case, and is expected to continue to show similar behaviour for higher qubit states.

III) **Separable states**: Here, we consider separable states which have the form $\rho = \sum_j p_j \otimes_i^n \rho_i^j$ with restriction that some part will be *quantum*. Here by *quantum*, we mean that there will be some local superposition in that part i.e., $\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_i^k.\rho_i^\ell] \neq 0$ for $k \neq \ell$. These can be of four types e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{cccq} &= \frac{1}{2}(|000+\rangle\langle 000+| + |1110\rangle\langle 1110|),\\
\rho_{qqcc} &= \frac{1}{2}(|++00\rangle\langle ++00| + |0011\rangle\langle 0011|),\\
\rho_{qqqc} &= \frac{1}{2}(|+++0\rangle\langle +++0| + |0001\rangle\langle 0001|),\\
\rho_{qqqq} &= \frac{1}{2}(|++++\rangle\langle ++++| + |0000\rangle\langle 0000|),
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$. Depending on the position of the 'q' and 'c' in the first three states, one can have many different states. Again one can replace $|+\rangle$ with more general state $|n\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+|n|^2}}(|0\rangle + n|1\rangle)$ with $n \in \mathbb{C}$. Some asymmetry can be introduced just by assigning different n values for different parts in the last three states.

The dissension vectors in track-I and track-II reveal their correlation contents as well as their identity, e.g., by looking at their dissension vectors one can easily identify the structure of these states separately. One can see the numerical values of the vectors $\vec{\delta}_1^1$, $\vec{\delta}_2^1$ and $\vec{\delta}_3^1$ in the table III and $\vec{\delta}_1^2$, $\vec{\delta}_2^2$ and $\vec{\delta}_3^2$ in the table IV. These two tracks are revealing the same type of information for these states.

IV) **Pure entangled states**: Here, we will consider three famous states, GHZ state $|\psi\rangle_{g_4}$, W-state $|w\rangle$ and Omega-state $|\Omega\rangle$ i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi\rangle_{g_4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle + |1111\rangle),\\
|w\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|1000\rangle + |0100\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0001\rangle),\\
|\Omega\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\psi^+0\rangle + |1\psi^-1\rangle),
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where $|\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$. Out of these states, $|\Omega\rangle$ is particularly robust state. The dissension vectors in the tables III and IV, indicates that these states are different from each other. The behavior is again along the same line as that for three-qubit states.

V) **Mixed entangled states**: In this category, we consider two states, Werner state, ρ_{wer} and mixture of W-state and GHZ state, ρ_{wg}, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{wer} &= \frac{(1-p)}{16} I + p\rho_{g_4},\\
\rho_{wg} &= (1-p)\rho_w + p\rho_{g_4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The dissension vectors are plotted in Fig.(4). The plots show how the vectors are changing with mixing parameter p. The different vectors are showing different behaviour.

If we introduce some noise (colored or white) in a state, what will be the behaviour of its dissension vectors? To study it, we have picked up the state $|\Omega\rangle$. After introduction of noises, the states will look like,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{wh} &= \frac{(1-p)}{16} I + p\rho_\Omega,\\
\rho_{col} &= (1-p)|0000\rangle\langle 0000| + p\rho_\Omega,
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where ρ_{wh} & ρ_{col} are the Omega-states mixed with white and colored noises respectively. In Fig (5), we observe that white noise has less affect on almost all dissension vectors.

$State$	$\vec{\delta}_1^1$	$\vec{\delta}_2^1$	$\vec{\delta}_3^1$
ρ_{g_4}	$\{1,1,1,1\}$	$\{-3,-3,-3,-3\}$	$\{1,1,1,1\}$
ρ_{pro}	$\{0,0,0,0\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{cccc}	$\{0,0,0,0\}$	$\{-3,-3,-3,-3\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{qqqq}	$\{0.35,0.35,0.35,0.35\}$	$\{-1.35,-1.35,-1.35,-1.35\}$	$\{0.11,0.11,0.11,0.11\}$
ρ_{cccq}	$\{0.2,0.2,0,0.2\}$	$\{-3,-3,-2.6,-1.8\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{ccqc}	$\{0.2,0,0.2,0.2\}$	$\{-3,-2.6,-1.8,-3\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{cqcc}	$\{0,0.2,0.2,0.2\}$	$\{-2.6,-1.8,-3,-3\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{qccc}	$\{0.2,0.2,0.2,0\}$	$\{-1.8,-3,-3,-2.6\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{ccqq}	$\{0.35,0.14,0.14,0.35\}$	$\{-2.8,-2.4,-1.6,-1.8\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{cqcq}	$\{0.14,0.35,0.2,0.35\}$	$\{-2.4,-1.8,-2.4,-1.8\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{cqqc}	$\{0.14,0.14,0.35,0.35\}$	$\{-2.4,-1.6,-1.8,-2.8\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{qcqc}	$\{0.35,0.2,0.35,0.14\}$	$\{-1.8,-2.4,-1.8,-2.4\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{qccq}	$\{0.35,0.35,0.14,0.14\}$	$\{-1.8,-2.8,-2.4,-1.6\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{qqcc}	$\{0.14,0.35,0.35,0.14\}$	$\{-1.6,-1.8,-2.8,-2.4\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{cqqq}	$\{0.26,0.26,0.26,0.46\}$	$\{-2.1,-1.5,-1.5,-1.7\}$	$\{0.18,0,0,0\}$
ρ_{qcqq}	$\{0.46,0.26,0.26,0.26\}$	$\{-1.7,-2.1,-1.5,-1.5\}$	$\{0,0.18,0,0\}$
ρ_{qqcq}	$\{0.26,0.46,0.26,0.26\}$	$\{-1.5,-1.7,-2.1,-1.5\}$	$\{0,0,0.18,0\}$
ρ_{qqqc}	$\{0.26,0.26,0.46,0.26\}$	$\{-1.5,-1.5,-1.7,-2.1\}$	$\{0,0,0,0,0.18\}$
ρ_w	$\{0.88,0.88,0.88,0.88\}$	$\{-1.75,-1.75,-1.75,-1.75\}$	$\{0.81,0.81,0.81,0.81\}$
ρ_Ω	$\{-2,-2,-2,-2\}$	$\{-5,-5,-5,-5\}$	$\{1,1,1,1\}$

TABLE III: Track-I dissension vectors for a few four-qubit states. Here, $\rho_{g_4} = |g_4\rangle\langle g_4|$, $\rho_w = |w\rangle\langle w|$ and $\rho_\Omega = |\Omega\rangle\langle\Omega|$.

$State$	$\vec{\delta}_1^2$	$\vec{\delta}_2^2$	$\vec{\delta}_3^2$
ρ_{g_4}	$\{1,1,1,1\}$	$\{-6,-6,-6,-6\}$	4
ρ_{pro}	$\{0,0,0,0\}$	$\{0,0,0,0\}$	0
ρ_{cccc}	$\{0,0,0,0\}$	$\{-6,-6,-6,-6\}$	0
ρ_{qqqq}	$\{0.5,0.5,0.5,0.5\}$	$\{-3.35,-3.35,-3.35,-3.35\}$	0.44
ρ_{cccq}	$\{0.2,0.2,0.2,0.2\}$	$\{-6,-6,-5.6,-4.8\}$	0
ρ_{ccqc}	$\{0.2,0.2,0.2,0.2\}$	$\{-6,-5.6,-4.8,-6\}$	0
ρ_{cqcc}	$\{0.2,0.2,0.2,0.2\}$	$\{-5.6,-4.8,-6,-6\}$	0
ρ_{qccc}	$\{0.2,0.2,0.2,0.2\}$	$\{-4.8,-6,-6,-5.6\}$	0
ρ_{ccqq}	$\{0.35,0.29,0.35,0.35\}$	$\{-5.6,-5.2,-4.4,-4.6\}$	0
ρ_{cqcq}	$\{0.35,0.35,0.35,0.35\}$	$\{-5.2,-4.6,-5.2,-4.6\}$	0
ρ_{cqqc}	$\{0.29,0.35,0.35,0.35\}$	$\{-5.2,-4.4,-4.6,-5.6\}$	0
ρ_{qcqc}	$\{0.35,0.35,0.35,0.35\}$	$\{-4.6,-5.2,-4.6,-5.2\}$	0
ρ_{qccq}	$\{0.35,0.35,0.29,0.35\}$	$\{-4.6,-5.6,-5.2,-4.4\}$	0
ρ_{qqcc}	$\{0.35,0.35,0.35,0.29\}$	$\{-4.2,-4.6,-5.6,-5.2\}$	0
ρ_{cqqq}	$\{0.4,0.4,0.46,0.46\}$	$\{-4.56,-3.92,-3.92,-4.14\}$	0.18
ρ_{qcqq}	$\{0.46,0.4,0.4,0.46\}$	$\{-4.14,-4.56,-3.92,-3.92\}$	0.18
ρ_{qqcq}	$\{0.46,0.46,0.4,0.4\}$	$\{-3.92,-4.14,-4.56,-3.92\}$	0.18
ρ_{qqqc}	$\{0.4,0.46,0.46,0.4\}$	$\{-3.92,-3.92,-4.14,-4.56\}$	0.18
ρ_w	$\{1.3,1.3,1.3,1.3\}$	$\{-4.75,-4.75,-4.75,-4.75\}$	3.24
ρ_Ω	$\{-2,-2,-2,-2\}$	$\{-10,-10,-10,-10\}$	4

TABLE IV: Track-II dissension vectors for a few four-qubit states.



FIG. 4: The figure shows how the dissension vectors behave as a function of mixing parameter, p for the four qubit states ρ_{wer} and ρ_{gw}. The subfigures $[(i)-(v)]$ depict the behaviour of the dissensions for the state, ρ_{wer} and $[(vi)-(x)]$ for ρ_{gw} where subfigures (i) and (vi) depict $\vec{\delta}_1^1$; (ii) and (vii) depict $\vec{\delta}_2^1$; (iii) and $(viii)$ depict $\vec{\delta}_3^1$; (iv) and (ix) depict $\vec{\delta}_1^2$ and (v) and (x) depict $\vec{\delta}_2^2$. (Note that we have plotted one of the elements from each dissension vectors. This is because within a vector each elements are same as the states are symmetric.)

D. Why track-II is useful?

From the tables for three-qubit and four-qubit states, we notice that when we take together the dissension vectors of track-I or track-II, we can characterize and quantify the quantumness of the states. This quantumness includes both local and nonlocal quantumness. Both tracks include different sets of measurements and portray different (but may be similar) features of the states. One may still ask if one could use only one track. Naively, it should be possible. However, there exist instances, when track-II does a better job in distinguishing the states of different but similar categories. As an example, we consider three different classes of biseparable states. Consider the states

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi\rangle_{i|jkl} &= |0\rangle|g3\rangle, \\
\rho^c_{i|jkl} &= \frac{1}{2}(|0g_3\rangle\langle 0g_3| + |1g_3\rangle\langle 1g_3|), \\
\rho^q_{i|jkl} &= \frac{1}{2}(|0g_3\rangle\langle 0g_3| + |+g_3\rangle\langle +g_3|),
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

where (i,j,k,l) can take any of (x,y,z,w) values but $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$. Here first state is a pure biseparable state. In this state, three qubits are entangled and are in GHZ state; the fourth qubit is not entangled. The second and third states are mixed states. The second state is a mixture of orthogonal components, while the third state has nonorthogonal components. The values of dissension vectors for the above states (with various permutations) in track-I and track-II are listed in the tables V and VI. We notice that for all these state categories, for 'parallel' states, dissension vectors are equal except $\vec{\delta}_2^2$. In particular, let us look at the states $\rho_{x|yzw} = |\psi\rangle_{x|yzw}\langle\psi|$, $\rho^c_{x|yzw}$, and $\rho^q_{x|yzw}$. For these states, all track-I dissension vectors are identical. Only one track-II dissension vector is different. Same is true for other permutations. That's why both tracks are useful to charactarise the quantumness present in a state.



FIG. 5: The figure shows how the dissension vectors behave as a function of mixing parameter, p for the four-qubit state, ρ_Ω when exposed with colored (red dashed line), and white noise (black solid line). The subfigures $[(i)-(v)]$ depict the behaviour of the dissension with subfigures (i) depicts $\vec{\delta}_1^1$; (ii) depicts $\vec{\delta}_2^1$; (iii) depicts $\vec{\delta}_3^1$; (iv) depicts $\vec{\delta}_1^2$ and (v) depicts $\vec{\delta}_2^2$. (Note that we have plotted one of the elements from each dissension vectors. This is because within a vector each elements are same as the state is symmetric.)

State	$\vec{\delta}_1^1$	$\vec{\delta}_2^1$	$\vec{\delta}_3^1$
$\rho_{x\vert yzw}$	$\{-1,0,0,0\}$	$\{0,-3,-3,-2\}$	$\{0,1,1,1\}$
$\rho_{y\vert xzw}$	$\{0,-1,0,0\}$	$\{-2,0,-3,-3\}$	$\{1,0,1,1\}$
$\rho_{z\vert xyw}$	$\{0,0,-1,0\}$	$\{-3,-2,0,-3\}$	$\{1,1,0,1\}$
$\rho_{w\vert xyz}$	$\{0,0,0,-1\}$	$\{-3,-3,-2,0\}$	$\{1,1,1,0\}$
$\rho^c_{x\vert yzw}$	$\{-1,0,0,0\}$	$\{0,-3,-3,-2\}$	$\{0,1,1,1\}$
$\rho^c_{y\vert xzw}$	$\{0,-1,0,0\}$	$\{-2,0,-3,-3\}$	$\{1,0,1,1\}$
$\rho^c_{z\vert xyw}$	$\{0,0,-1,0\}$	$\{-3,-2,0,-3\}$	$\{1,1,0,1\}$
$\rho^c_{w\vert xyz}$	$\{0,0,0,-1\}$	$\{-3,-3,-2,0\}$	$\{1,1,1,0\}$
$\rho^q_{x\vert yzw}$	$\{-1,0,0,0\}$	$\{0,-3,-3,-2\}$	$\{0,1,1,1\}$
$\rho^q_{y\vert xzw}$	$\{0,-1,0,0\}$	$\{-2,0,-3,-3\}$	$\{1,0,1,1\}$
$\rho^q_{z\vert xyw}$	$\{0,0,-1,0\}$	$\{-3,-2,0,-3\}$	$\{1,1,0,1\}$
$\rho^q_{w\vert xyz}$	$\{0,0,0,-1\}$	$\{-3,-3,-2,0\}$	$\{1,1,1,0\}$

TABLE V: Track-I dissension vectors for a few specific four qubit states. The table shows that one will not be able to distinguish the states from the dissension vectors.

State	$\vec{\delta}_1^2$	$\vec{\delta}_2^2$	$\vec{\delta}_3^2$
$\rho_{x\shortmid yzw}$	$\{-1,0,0,0\}$	$\{-3,-6,-6,-5\}$	3
$\rho_{y\shortmid xzw}$	$\{0,-1,0,0\}$	$\{-5,-3,-6,-6\}$	3
$\rho_{z\shortmid xyw}$	$\{0,0,-1,0\}$	$\{-6,-5,-3,-6\}$	3
$\rho_{w\shortmid xyz}$	$\{0,0,0,-1\}$	$\{-6,-6,-5,-3\}$	3
$\rho^c_{x\shortmid yzw}$	$\{-1,0,0,0\}$	$\{-6,-7,-7,-6\}$	3
$\rho^c_{y\shortmid xzw}$	$\{0,-1,0,0\}$	$\{-6,-6,-7,-7\}$	3
$\rho^c_{z\shortmid xyw}$	$\{0,0,-1,0\}$	$\{-7,-6,-6,-7\}$	3
$\rho^c_{w\shortmid xyz}$	$\{0,0,0,-1\}$	$\{-7,-7,-6,-6\}$	3
$\rho^q_{x\shortmid yzw}$	$\{-1,0,0,0\}$	$\{-4.8,-6.6,-6.6,-5.6\}$	3
$\rho^q_{y\shortmid xzw}$	$\{0,-1,0,0\}$	$\{-5.6,-4.8,-6.6,-6.6\}$	3
$\rho^q_{z\shortmid xyw}$	$\{0,0,-1,0\}$	$\{-6.6,-5.6,-4.8,-6.6\}$	3
$\rho^q_{w\shortmid xyz}$	$\{0,0,0,-1\}$	$\{-6.6,-6.6,-5.6,-4.8\}$	3

TABLE VI: Track-II dissension vectors for a few specific four qubit states. The table shows that one will be able to distinguish the states from the dissension vectors.

VI. BEHAVIOUR OF QUANTUMNESS UNDER LOCAL NOISE

For almost all quantum processing devices, effect of noise is inevitable. This leads us to examine the behaviour of our dissension vector under local noise. From a property of a measure of quantum correlations, e.g. Q, for the bipartite state ρ_{12},

$$Q(\rho_{12}) \geq Q(\Lambda_{12}[\rho_{12}]), \tag{43}$$

where $\Lambda_{12} = \Lambda_1 \otimes \Lambda_2$ are local channels. Under global operations, the situation may be different. One can create or increase entanglement under such operations.

It is evident that our measures are also affected by the local noise. In this respect we can define two important classes of channels- a unital/semiclassical channel $\Lambda_{u/sc}$ is defined as $\Lambda_{u/sc}(\frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}) = \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}$ while for a non-unital channel Λ_{nu}, $\Lambda_{nu}(\frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}) \neq \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2}$. Streltsov et al. [23] have shown that a local quantum channel acting on a single qubit can create 'quantumness' in a multiqubit system iff it is neither semiclassical nor unital. This results holds for the dissension vector also. In our vector type measure, at least one of the elements will be affected. For example, let us consider a classical state $\rho_{cl} = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle\langle 0000| + |1111\rangle\langle 1111|)$. Now, application of non-unital channel $\{E_1 = |0\rangle\langle 0|, E_2 = |n\rangle\langle 1|\}$ with $|n\rangle = \frac{1}{1+n^2}(|0\rangle + n|1\rangle)$ $(n \in \mathbb{R})$ on any subsystem will make the state non-classical and will have non-zero element in the vector (see Fig.(6)).



FIG. 6: The figure depicts the behaviour of the "dissension vectors" of ρ_{cl} under non-unital channel parameter n. Here, the non-unital channel (Λ_{nu}) is applied on the first qubit. The dissension vectors, $\vec{\delta}_1^1$ (blue dashed line), $\vec{\delta}_2^1$ (red solid line), and $\vec{\delta}_1^2$ (black solid line) are nonzero for finite value of n. (Note that we have plotted one of the elements from each dissension vectors. This is because within a vector each elements are same.)

VII. AVERAGE QUANTUMNESS OF MULTIQUBIT STATES

A vector measure characterizes a state in a fine-grained manner. Sometime, one may be interested in average correlation properties. For some quantum tasks, average properties may be relevant. For such tasks, two states with different vector measures, but same 'average' properties may both be suitable. Therefore, in this section, we consider average of the dissension vectors. We will investigate if our measures are good in characterizing the states if we take average in a particular dissension quantity. Let us define the average dissension quantities,

$$\langle \delta_1^\ell \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \delta_{1k}^\ell, \tag{44}$$

where $\ell = 1, 2$ denotes the track in which we are calculating them. Similarly, we can have different quantities like $\{\langle \delta_i^\ell \rangle; i = 1, 2, ..., n-1\}$, except the quantity, δ_{n-1}^2 which is a symmetric quantity and sum of all bipartite discord. Here, we will illustrate these measures particularly for some three qubit states.

State	$\langle \delta_1^1 \rangle$	$\langle \delta_2^1 \rangle$
ρ_{g_3}	-2	1
$\rho_{i\downarrow jk}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$
ρ_{pro}	0	0
ρ_{ccc}	-2	0
ρ_{ccq}	$-\frac{4}{3}$	0
ρ_{qqc}	-0.92	0.07
ρ_{qqq}	-0.67	0.15
$\rho^c_{i\downarrow jk}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$
$\rho^q_{x\downarrow yz}$	-0.24	0.4
ρ_w	-1.08	0.92

TABLE VII: Track-I average dissensions for few three-qubit states.

State	$\langle \delta_1^2 \rangle$	δ_2^2
ρ_{g_3}	-3	3
$\rho_{i\downarrow jk}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	2
ρ_{pro}	0	0
ρ_{ccc}	-3	0
ρ_{ccq}	-2.06	0
ρ_{qqc}	-1.46	0.22
ρ_{qqq}	-1.06	0.45
$\rho^c_{x\downarrow yz}$	$-\frac{2}{3}$	2
$\rho^q_{x\downarrow yz}$	$-0.6\}$	1.2
ρ_w	-1.75	2.76

TABLE VIII: Track-II average dissensions for few three-qubit states.

Results are presented in the tables VII and VIII. As expected, once we look at the average properties, some states cannot be distinguished. For example ρ_{ccq}, ρ_{cqc}, and ρ_{qcc} have same average quantumness.

VIII. CONCLUSION

By considering the quantum discord as a measure of the quantumness of a two-qubit state, we argued that a vector quantity does a better job in characterizing a state. We generalized the discord to n-qubit systems – dissension. It is based on n-variable mutual information. We argued that though multivariate mutual information can be negative, it may not be a drawback. For a n-qubit state, one can introduce (n - 1) vector measures to characterize the state. We considered two tracks of these measures for a two-qubit, three-qubit, and four-qubit systems. We showed how various classes of states can be distinguished and characterized using these measures. More work is still required to understand these measures and how useful they are beyond what we have considered. For example: Can they characterize the resources of a state better for a specific task?.

Acknowledgement: Author SS would like to thank Mr. Abhishek Deshpande and Dr. Indranil Chakraborty for having useful

discussion.

[1] Kavan Modi, Aharon Brodutch, Hugo Cable, Tomasz Paterek, and Vlatko Vedral. The classical-quantum boundary for correlations: Discord and related measures. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 84:1655–1707, Nov 2012.

[2] Ryszard Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Michał Horodecki, and Karol Horodecki. Quantum entanglement. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 81:865–942, Jun 2009.

[3] R. Jozsa. An introduction to measurement based quantum computation. *eprint arXiv:quant-ph/0508124*, August 2005.

[4] Rafael Chaves and Fernando de Melo. Noisy one-way quantum computations: The role of correlations. *Phys. Rev. A*, 84:022324, Aug 2011.

[5] Animesh Datta, Anil Shaji, and Carlton M. Caves. Quantum discord and the power of one qubit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:050502, Feb 2008.

[6] Nicolas Gisin, Grégoire Ribordy, Wolfgang Tittel, and Hugo Zbinden. Quantum cryptography. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 74:145–195, Mar 2002.

[7] Vittorio Giovannetti, Seth Lloyd, and Lorenzo Maccone. Quantum metrology. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:010401, Jan 2006.

[8] Harold Ollivier and Wojciech H. Zurek. Quantum discord: A measure of the quantumness of correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 88:017901, Dec 2001.

[9] L Henderson and V Vedral. Classical, quantum and total correlations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 34(35):6899, 2001.

[10] Michał Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Ryszard Horodecki, Jonathan Oppenheim, Aditi Sen(De), Ujjwal Sen, and Barbara Synak-Radtke. Local versus nonlocal information in quantum-information theory: Formalism and phenomena. *Phys. Rev. A*, 71:062307, Jun 2005.

[11] A. R. Usha Devi and A. K. Rajagopal. Generalized information theoretic measure to discern the quantumness of correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100:140502, Apr 2008.

[12] Kavan Modi, Tomasz Paterek, Wonmin Son, Vlatko Vedral, and Mark Williamson. Unified view of quantum and classical correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 104:080501, Feb 2010.

[13] M. Okrasa and Z. Walczak. Quantum discord and multipartite correlations. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 96(6):60003, 2011.

[14] C. C. Rulli and M. S. Sarandy. Global quantum discord in multipartite systems. *Phys. Rev. A*, 84:042109, Oct 2011.

[15] I. Chakrabarty, P. Agrawal, and A. K. Pati. Quantum dissension: Generalizing quantum discord for three-qubit states. *The European Physical Journal D*, 65(3):605–612, 2011.

[16] Raymond Laflamme, D. Cory, C. Negrevergne, and L. Viola. NMR quantum information processing and entanglement. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 2:166 – 176, Feb 2002.

[17] Vaibhav Madhok and Animesh Datta. Interpreting quantum discord through quantum state merging. *Phys. Rev. A*, 83:032323, Mar 2011.

[18] Michał Horodecki, Karol Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, Ryszard Horodecki, Jonathan Oppenheim, Aditi Sen(De), and Ujjwal Sen. Local information as a resource in distributed quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90:100402, Mar 2003.

[19] Jonathan Oppenheim, Michał Horodecki, Paweł Horodecki, and Ryszard Horodecki. Thermodynamical approach to quantifying quantum correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 89:180402, Oct 2002.

[20] A. K. Rajagopal and R. W. Rendell. Separability and correlations in composite states based on entropy methods. *Phys. Rev. A*, 66:022104, Aug 2002.

[21] Borivoje Dakić, Vlatko Vedral, and Časlav Brukner. Necessary and sufficient condition for nonzero quantum discord. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:190502, Nov 2010.

[22] P. Agrawal, I. Chakrabarty, S. Sazim, and A. K. Pati. Quantum Discord has local and nonlocal quantumness. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2015.

[23] Alexander Streltsov, Hermann Kampermann, and Dagmar Bruß. Behavior of quantum correlations under local noise. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107:170502, Oct 2011.

[24] Gian Luca Giorgi, Bruno Bellomo, Fernando Galve, and Roberta Zambrini. Genuine quantum and classical correlations in multipartite systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107:190501, Nov 2011.

[25] Berry Groisman, Sandu Popescu, and Andreas Winter. Quantum, classical, and total amount of correlations in a quantum state. *Phys. Rev. A*, 72:032317, Sep 2005.

[26] Z. Walczak. Total correlations and mutual information. *Physics Letters A*, 373:1818–1822, May 2009.

[27] Nan Li and Shunlong Luo. Total versus quantum correlations in quantum states. *Phys. Rev. A*, 76:032327, Sep 2007.

[28] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami. Negative entropy and information in quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 79:5194–5197, Dec 1997.

[29] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami. Quantum extension of conditional probability. *Phys. Rev. A*, 60:893–897, Aug 1999.

[30] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter. Partial quantum information. *Nature*, 436:673–676, August 2005.

[31] L. del Rio, J. Aberg, R. Renner, O. Dahlsten, and V. Vedral. The thermodynamic meaning of negative entropy. *Nature*, 474:61 – 63, june 2011.

[32] Michał Horodecki, Jonathan Oppenheim, and Andreas Winter. Quantum state merging and negative information. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 269(1):107–136, 2007.

[33] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, USA, 1991.

[34] N. J. Cerf, S. Massar, and S. Schneider. Multipartite classical and quantum secrecy monotones. *Phys. Rev. A*, 66:042309, Oct 2002.

[35] A. Kumar. Multiparty Operational Quantum Mutual Information. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2015.